

## \*Null Objects and VP ellipsis in European and Brazilian Portuguese

Sonia Cyrino and Gabriela Matos

**Key words:** Null Object, VP Ellipsis, Null Complement Anaphora, islands, non-animacy condition, Verbal sequences, VPE licensing, parallelism requirement, European Portuguese, Brazilian Portuguese.

### Introduction

Null Object and VP ellipsis share the property of involving the omission of the complement selected by the verb. Their occurrence across languages does not fully overlap. In Portuguese, both constructions coexist, some sentences being ambiguous between the two constructions. In this section we will outline the scope of our study, in sections 2 and 3 we will respectively analyze the properties of Null Object and VP ellipsis in European and Brazilian Portuguese, (henceforth, EP and BP).

Null Object (henceforth, Null\_Obj) designates the absence of the phonological expression of the necessary nominal internal complement of a verb and corresponds to a silent DP that could be recovered from a situational or linguistic context.

This construction has been the topic of various studies since the eighties, in the Principles and Parameters framework. The issue emerged in the discussion of empty categories and the Null Subject Parameter, from the observation that some languages allow the complement of transitive verbs to be phonologically null. The seminal work on Null\_Obj was published by Huang (1984) and it focus on Chinese, a language that allows both subjects and objects to be null. In Chinese, null subjects can be pronominal or variables, but null objects are variables bound by a discourse topic.

Following that work, Null\_Obj have been discussed in many languages, among them, EP (Raposo 1986, 2004, Duarte 1987, Duarte & Costa 2013), and BP (Galves 1989; Farrell 1990; Kato 1993; Cyrino 1997). Many kinds of omitted direct objects received attention in the literature, namely:

Deitic and situational Null-Obj: the referent of the null object is recovered from the situational context:

- (1) *Envie\_\_ por correio.*  
send     by mail  
‘Send this/that by mail.’
- (2) [Situation: Someone sees a famous star in a restaurant and makes the comment:]  
*Eu vi \_\_ na TV ontem.*  
I    saw    on.the TV yesterday  
‘Eu saw him on TV yesterday.’

---

\* Acknowledgements: This research has been funded by the following research grants: Brazilian CNPQ – Conselho Nacional para o Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico (research grant 303742/20013-5) and FAPESP-Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado de São Paulo (research grant 2012/06078-9), Portuguese FCT-Fundação para a Ciência e Tecnologia (project PEst-OE/LIN/UI0214/2013). We also thanks an anonymous reviewer for their helpful comments on a previous version of this paper.

Cognate Null-Obj: the null object refers to an object easily recovered from the lexical content of the verb:

- (3) *Durante as minhas férias, quero sobretudo ler\_\_.*  
during the my vacation want mainly read  
'During my vacation, I mainly want to read.'

Arbitrary Null-Obj, where the missing object is understood as part of the lexical meaning of some verbs:

- (4) *Isto leva à seguinte conclusão.*  
this leads to-the following conclusion  
'This leads (us/people) to the following conclusion.'

Anaphoric Null-Obj: the null object has a linguistic antecedent.

- (5) *Ele experimentou o casaco mas não comprou\_\_.*  
he tried on the coat but not bought  
'He tried on the coat but he did not buy (it).'

As shown in the examples (1) to (5), Portuguese allows different types of Null\_Obj. In this work we will focus on definite anaphoric and situational null objects, i.e., the cases in (2) and (5).

VP ellipsis (henceforth, VPE) designates the lack of the phonological expression that includes the verbal complement of a verb or verbal sequence and optionally its adjunct(s). Early analyses on VP ellipsis focused on English. In this language VP ellipsis only occurs with auxiliary verbs, the infinitival marker *to* and the copulative verb "be":

- (6) Mary loves Peter and Ann does \_\_, too.  
(7) Mary wants to buy an encyclopedia and I also want to \_\_.  
(8) A: Who is the best basketball player in the neighborhood?  
B: John is \_\_.

The study of predicate ellipsis has been extended to other languages, and a different strategy of VP ellipsis has been put forth, where the elliptical VP is licensed by a main verb. Goldberg (2005) called this strategy verb stranding VPE. Raposo (1986) was the first to claim the existence of this strategy in EP.

- (9) A: *A empregada colocou os livros na estante?*  
the housemaid put the books on-the shelf  
'Did the housemaid put the books on the shelf?'  
B: *Sim, colocou \_\_.*  
Yes, put  
Yes, she did.

Within the Principles and Parameters framework, VPE analyses mainly focused on the licensing condition(s) on the elliptical constituent and the recovering strategy of ellipsis. We will retain these topics in the study of VPE in EP and BP.

## Null-Obj in EP and BP

The recurring issues on Null-Obj in EP and BP are the determination of the omitted constituent and the [ $\pm$  animacy] status of its antecedent.

### *The nature of the empty category*

Null-Obj has been first characterized for EP by Raposo (1986). He showed that the content of the object gap could be recovered by the pragmatic (10a) or the linguistic (10b) context, and denoted entities with specific definite content, as attested by their capacity to alternate with definite clitic pronouns (11):

- (10) a. *A Joana viu \_ na TV ontem.* [EP]  
           the Joana saw \_ on the TV yesterday  
           ‘Joana saw (it/him/her/them) on TV yesterday.’  
       b. *A Maria pegou nos livros e guardou \_ cuidadosamente na estante.*  
           the Maria pick up in-the books and put carefully in-the shelf  
           ‘Maria pick up the books and carefully put (them) on the shelf.’
- (11) a. *A Joana viu-o(s)/a(s) na TV ontem.* [EP]  
           the Joana saw-CL.3MASC/FEM.SG/PL on-the TV yesterday  
           ‘Joana saw them on TV yesterday.’  
       b. *A Maria pegou nos livros e guardou-os cuidadosamente na estante.*  
           the Maria pick up in-the books and put-CL.3PL carefully in-the shelf  
           ‘Mary pick up the books and carefully put them in the shelf.’

Raposo pointed out that the availability of definite Null-Obj distinguishes EP from other Romance languages, which require a definite overt pronoun (see (12) for Spanish and in (13) for French):

- (12) *Maria \*(los) vio en la tele ayer.*  
       Maria (CL.3PL) saw on the TV yesterday  
       ‘Maria saw them on TV yesterday.’
- (13) *Marie \*(les) a vu à la télé hier.*  
       Marie (CL.3PL) has seen on the TV yesterday  
       ‘Marie has seen them on TV yesterday.’

Raposo remarked that Null-Obj in EP and Chinese behave alike. In both languages they may be pragmatic controlled (10a) and the object gap functions as a variable. Thus, following Huang (1984), he assumes that Null-Obj in EP involves a Topic position, whose meaning is recovered from the situational context:

- (14) [Top - ] [a Joana viu \_ na TV ontem]

He also presents evidence that the omitted object is an A'-bound variable, contrasting the examples (15) and (16). In (15a) the object gap inside the embedded sentence may not co-refer with the subject of the embedding clause, in contrast with an overt pronoun in object position (15b). As shown in (16), the omitted object in Null-Obj behaves like a variable

resulting from wh-movement — in both cases there is as a strong crossover violation, i.e., a Principle C effect, since the variable must be free within the scope domain of its A'-binder, the null operator in (15a), *quem* 'who', in (16):

- (15) a. \**Ele<sub>i</sub> pensa que eu recomendei<sub>i</sub> ao professor.* [EP]  
           he thinks that I recommended to-the professor  
       b. *Ele pensa que eu o recomendei ao professor.* [EP]  
           he thinks that I CL.Masc.3SG recommended to-the professor.  
           'He thinks that I recommended him to the professor.'
- (16) \**Quem<sub>i</sub> é que ele<sub>i</sub> pensa que eu recomendei \_\_\_<sub>i</sub> ao professor?*  
       who is<sub>that</sub> he thinks that I recommended to-the professor  
       'Who does he thinks that I recommended to the professor.'

However, departing from Huang, who directly relates the variable to the “zero topic”, Raposo assumes that the null operator arises from movement of the omitted object to Comp in syntax. A rule of predication would relate Top and the null operator in Comp, establishing its content in a latter level of representation, sensitive to discourse/pragmatic information:

- (17) [Top - ]<sub>p</sub> [[c OP<sub>i</sub>-]<sub>p</sub> [a Joana viu<sub>i</sub> na TV ontem ]]

Raposo also shows that Null-Obj in EP involves A'-Movement in overt syntax, since it is excluded from islands, namely from the Complex-NP (18), the Sentential Subject (19) and the Sentential Adjunct (20):

- (18) a. *O rapaz trouxe\_\_\_ agora mesmo da pastelaria.* [EP]  
           the boy brought right now from the pastry shop.  
       b. \**O rapaz que trouxe \_\_\_ agora mesmo da pastelaria era o teu*  
           the boy who brought right now from-the pastry shop was the your  
           afilhado. [EP]  
           godson
- (19) [context: talking about a new personal computer]  
       \**Que a IBM venda\_\_\_ a particulares suprende-me.* [EP]  
       that the IBM sell.SUBJUNCTIVE to private people surprises-CL.ACC.1SG
- (20) [context: talking about the map of the tesor] [EP]  
       \**O pirata partiu para as Caraíbas depois de ter guardado\_\_\_ no cofre.*  
           the pirate left to the Caraíbas after of has kept in-the safe

Also, like other syntactic A'-movement variables, the object gap in EP may license parasitic gaps in adjunct adverbial sentences occurring after the Null-Obj clause. As shown in (21), the parasitic gap in this example is as acceptable as the anaphoric null object in (5), above:

- (21) *Arrumei\_\_\_ na estante sem sequer ler\_\_\_<sub>pg</sub>.* [EP]  
       put in the shelf without even read

Since this analysis captures the core behavior of Null-Obj in EP, for the most part, it has been kept in later work, which mainly discussed the initial nature of the object gap and its final landing site in this language variety.

Raposo (1986) imputes the need of object movement to the original nature of the null object, which he claims to be PRO, a category that may not be governed. Thus, PRO must

raise from object position to Comp, a non-thematic position. Assuming the configuration (17), Raposo abandons Huang's (1984) parametric criterion to distinguish languages with and without Null-Obj. According to Huang, discourse oriented languages, like Chinese, accept a null R-expression A'-bound by a null topic, but sentence oriented languages, like English, do not. For Raposo, the parametric variation between these types of languages relies on the application of the Predication rule: in Chinese and EP this rule may apply to a pragmatic topic, in English, French or Spanish it cannot.

Duarte (1987) casts doubts on the derivational change of the null category, and proposes that it should be basically generated as a variable. She closely relates Null\_Obj in EP to Topicalization, a specific topic construction that A'-moves a constituent that binds a variable:

- (22) *Esse jogo, a Joana viu\_\_ na TV ontem.* [EP]  
 that match the Joana saw on the TV yesterday  
 'That match, Joana saw (it) on TV yesterday.'

Accepting that Topicalization in EP involves adjunction to CP or IP, she presents an alternative configuration for Null\_Obj, where the null topic in A'-position is included within the Comp domain:

- (23) [<sub>CP</sub> [<sub>Top</sub> - ] [<sub>IP</sub> a Joana viu \_ na TV ontem] ]

Accordingly, Duarte reviews Raposo's (1986) formulation of the Null-Obj parameter and reformulates it in terms much closer to those of Huang (1984):

- (24) The content of a null (or overt) syntactic operator may/or may not be set in LF' by an element of the discursive or situational context.

In turn, Raposo (2004) reexamines his previous analysis and relates Null\_Obj in EP to Clitic Left Dislocation (CLLD), (25). He claims that the object gap is merged as a DP with a null definite determiner that selects [<sub>NP</sub> *pro*], (26):

- (25) *Esse livro, eu só o encontrei na FNAC.* [EP]  
 that book I only CL.Masc.3SG found in-the FNAC  
 'That book, I only found it at FNAC.'
- (26) a. *Eu só encontrei \_ na FNAC.* [EP]  
 I only found in-the FNAC  
 'I only found it in FNAC.'
- b. *Eu só encontrei [<sub>DP</sub>  $\emptyset_{\text{def}}$  [<sub>NP</sub> *pro*]] na FNAC*

Raposo argues that in the context of a definite null Det, *pro* is not adequately identified because Det lacks number and gender features. To be recovered, *pro* has to move to a position as close as possible of its antecedent, a topic or an argument in A-position. He claims that *pro* adjoins to the head F, a functional category in the sentence left periphery that codifies the interplay between LF with the semantic, discursive and pragmatic systems. In that position *pro* acts as an operator that A'-binds and identifies its copy, represented as 't' in (27):

- (27) (*esse livro*), [<sub>FP</sub> *pro* F [<sub>TP</sub> eu só encontrei [<sub>DP</sub>  $\emptyset$  [<sub>NPT</sub>]] na FNAC.

Raposo's (2004) analysis allows him to assume that there is no change in the nature of the null category during the derivation, while maintaining the core ideas of his original

proposal: the characterization of the object gap as a variable resulting from A'-Movement in syntax, and the indirect relation between the null operator (*pro* in F) and the Topic in CLLD. However, this CLLD approach is challenged by himself, since he denies the possibility of considering the D heading the null object DP as a clitic, given its lack of phonological features.

Turning now to BP, within the Government and Binding framework, Farrell (1990), Galves (1989) and Kato (1993) proposed *pro* for the empty category occurring in Null-Obj, based on the fact that this construction may appear in islands in BP, as shown by the acceptability of (28) in PB in contrast with its marginality in EP (cf. (18b)-(20)):

- (28) a. *O rapaz que trouxe \_\_ agora mesmo da pastelaria era o teu afilhado.* [BP]  
 the boy that brought now just of-the pastry shop was the your godson  
 'The boy that brought (it) just now from the pastry shop was your godson.'  
 b. *O pirata partiu para as Caraíbas depois de ter guardado \_\_*  
 the pirate left to the Caraibas after of have kept  
*cuidadosamente no cofre.* [BP]  
 carefully in-the safe.  
 'The pirate left for the Caraibe after having kept (it) carefully in the safe.'

Additionally, Farrell (1990) rejects the variable status of null object in BP because some sentences, which are unacceptable in some contexts and would be analyzed as Principle C effects (29a,c), become acceptable in other contexts (29b):

- (29) a. *\*Ele<sub>i</sub> disse que Maria não beijou \_\_<sub>i</sub>* [BP]  
 He said that Maria not kissed  
 'He<sub>i</sub> said that Maria didn't kiss (him<sub>i</sub>).'  
 b. *Todo mundo disse que Maria beijou Pedro<sub>i</sub> depois do baile.*  
 All world said that Maria kissed Pedro after of-the dance.  
*Mas ele<sub>i</sub> disse que Maria não beijou \_\_<sub>i</sub>.* [BP]  
 But he said that Maria not kissed  
 'Everybody said that Maria kissed Pedro<sub>i</sub> after the dance. But he<sub>i</sub> said that Maria didn't kiss (him<sub>i</sub>).'  
 c. *OP<sub>i</sub> ele<sub>i</sub> disse que Maria não beijou \_\_<sub>i</sub>.* [BP]  
 he said that Maria not kissed.

To account for the marginality of (29a), he claims that the antecedent of a null object in a complement clause cannot be the subject of the matrix sentence, but he assumes that this is possible in adjunct clauses in BP, on the basis of examples like (30a), which are rejected by several BP native speakers, unless they occur in an adequate discourse context (31b):

- (30) a. *(\*)A Júlia<sub>i</sub> sempre chora quando ponho \_\_<sub>i</sub> no berço* [BP]  
 the Júlia always cries when put in-the cradle.  
 'Julia<sub>i</sub> always cries when (I) put (her<sub>i</sub>) in the cradle.'  
 b. *Eu sempre ponho meus filhos no berço sem problemas.* [BP]  
 I always put-1SG my children in-the cradle without problems.  
*Mas a Júlia<sub>i</sub> sempre chora quando ponho \_\_<sub>i</sub> no berço.* [BP]  
 But the Júlia always cries when put in-the cradle.  
 'I always put my children in the cradle with no problems. But Julia<sub>i</sub> always cries when (I) put (her<sub>i</sub>) in the cradle.'

However, there is some disagreement regarding the licensing and identification of *pro* among the analyses that take this category as null object in BP.

Farrell (1990) considers that the omitted object is formally licensed by INFL or V, and intrinsically specified as 3rd person. But Kato (1993) remarks that, then, BP would have one kind of *pro* for subjects and another for objects.

Galves (1989) assumes that the object *pro* is a base generated empty category bound to an external subject in BP, being a simultaneously free and bound empty category. In later work she claims that the object *pro* is licensed by V and identified by a *pro* in Spec-Agr, leaving, however unexplained the unacceptability of (29a), (30a).

Kato (1993) proposes that the null object in BP is an instance of *pro* which is identified as 3rd person and licensed by a null clitic, whose antecedent is always in an anti-c-command position.

Barra-Ferreira (2000) conceives the null object in BP as a *pro* without Case features, which is A'-bound by a null topic. According to him, sentences with topicalized elements may be obtained through movement to Top, or result from the insertion of a caseless *pro*. Thus the object position in (31) is ambiguous between a trace or a caseless *pro*:

- (31) *Esse livro<sub>i</sub>, a Maria conhece o cara que escreveu \_\_\_\_<sub>i</sub>.* [BP]  
 This book the Maria know the guy that wrote  
 'This book, Maria knows the person who wrote (it)'.

Since traces of movement are excluded from islands, a sentence like (32) could only contain a *pro* in object position. It should be grammatical in BP, but marginal in EP, which is, in fact, considered degraded by most EP native speakers:

- (32) *Esse livro<sub>i</sub>, eu ainda não consegui um aluno que lesse pro<sub>i</sub>.* [BP/\*EP]  
 that book I still not get-1sg a student that read  
 'This student<sub>i</sub>, I still haven't got a student that read (it<sub>i</sub>)'

Still, the proposal for the null object in BP as a *pro* is not uncontroversial, and does not explain why *pro* behaves differently from an overt an pronoun in sentences like (33):

- (33) *O Pedro<sub>i</sub> disse que ela não beijou {\*\_<sub>i</sub><sup>N</sup> ele<sub>i</sub>}.* [BP]  
 the Pedro said that she not kissed\_\_/\_him  
 'Pedro<sub>i</sub> said that she didn't kiss (him<sub>i</sub>)'

Furthermore, the null object cannot be *pro*, because it differs from *pro* in accepting both strict and sloppy readings:

- (34) *De noite, João abriu a janela, mas Pedro preferiu fechar\_\_.* [BP]  
 At night João opened the window but Pedro preferred to-close  
 'At night, João opened the window, but Pedro preferred to close it.'  
 \_\_ = João's window (*strict reading*)  
 \_\_ = Pedro's window (*sloppy reading*)

Cyrino (1997) presents a different proposal. She claims that the null object in BP is the result of DP ellipsis, due to a diachronic process that related propositional ellipsis to the demise of third person clitics in the language.

The proposal that the null object in BP is an instance of DP ellipsis is backed up by two

facts that point to a similarity with the propositional ellipsis: the null object in BP requires a [-animate] antecedent and allows strict/sloppy readings.

### *Animacy restrictions on Null-Obj antecedent*

Within Principles and Parameters framework, several authors correlated the fact that the null object preferably has a [-animate] antecedent with the nature of the null object.

Contrasting sentences like (35) with (36), Bianchi & Figueiredo (1994) propose to split the analysis for the empty category into two, variables and *pro*, according to whether the antecedent is [+animate] or [-animate]:

- (35) a. \**O José<sub>i</sub> impediu a esposa de matar \_\_\_\_<sub>i</sub>* [BP]  
           the Jose prevented the wife of kill  
           ‘José<sub>i</sub> prevented his wife from killing (him<sub>i</sub>).’  
       b. \**O José<sub>i</sub> sabe que a Maria gostaria de conhecer \_\_\_\_<sub>i</sub>*  
           the José knows that the Maria likes of know  
           ‘José<sub>i</sub> knows that Maria would like to meet (him<sub>i</sub>).’  
 (36) a. *Esse tipo de garrafa<sub>i</sub> impede as crianças de abrirem \_\_\_\_<sub>i</sub> sozinhas.* [BP]  
           this kind of bottle prevents the children of open alone.  
           ‘This kind of bottle prevents the children from opening (it) by themselves.’  
       b. *Esse prato<sub>i</sub> exige que o cozinheiro acabe de preparar \_\_\_\_<sub>i</sub> na mesa.* [BP]  
           this dish requires that the cook finish of prepare in-the table.  
           ‘This dish requires that the cook finishes to prepare (it) at table.’

For the [+animate] antecedent, the null object would be a variable, thus, not permitted in islands, (37); for the [-animate] antecedent, it would be a *pro*, hence allowed in island domains, (38)

- (37) \**O José<sub>i</sub> conheceu a mulher que beijou \_\_\_\_<sub>k</sub>.* [BP]  
           the José knew the woman that kissed  
           ‘José<sub>i</sub> knew the woman who kissed (him<sub>k</sub>).’  
 (38) *O José<sub>i</sub> conheceu a mulher que comprou \_\_\_\_<sub>k</sub>.* [BP]  
           the José knew the woman that bought.  
           ‘José<sub>i</sub> knew the woman who bought (it).’

Cyrino (1997) remarks that the fact that the null object in BP has a [-animate] antecedent cannot be captured by the variable/*pro* analysis. The sentence (39b), with a null object and an overt pronoun, show that the only interpretation for the null object is the non-animate antecedent, *o rosto dele* ‘his face’, while the overt pronoun may refer back either to *o rosto dele* or to *meu pai*, the latter a [+animate] antecedent:

- (39) a. *Eu nunca vejo o [meu pai]<sub>i</sub>. Nem me lembro d[o rosto dele]<sub>j</sub>.* [BP]  
           I never see the my father not-even me remember of-the face his  
       b. *Acho que já esqueci {\_\_\_\_<sub>i</sub>/ele<sub>i</sub>}. [BP]  
           think that already forgot {\_\_\_\_/him/it}  
           ‘I never see my father. I don’t even remember his face. I think I forgot (it)/him/it.’*

In order to explain the animacy restrictions in null objects (and full pronouns), Cyrino, Duarte & Kato (2000) propose a Referentiality Hierarchy, which stated that if a language has



an empty category for a certain element, it will also have this empty category for other elements which are lower in referentiality.

(40) Referentiality hierarchy

non-arguments    propositions [-animate]    [+animate]  
 3rd person    2nd person    1st person  
 [-specific][+specific]  
 [-referential] <— ----- —> [+referential]

This hierarchy proposes that referentiality is highly relevant in pronominalization in several languages. Thus, [+N, +human] arguments are in the highest position in the hierarchy, and non-arguments, in the lowest. Regarding pronouns, the speaker (= I) and the hearer (= you), being inherently humans are in the highest and the third person that refers to a proposition is in lowest, with the [-human] entity in the middle. The [ $\pm$  specific] features interact with all these features. Languages will vary in the spell out of the pronouns.

For the object, specifically, the authors predicted that if the input exhibits a pronoun or a clitic in a lower position of the hierarchy, the child in the acquisition process will consider it a weak pronoun in either a head or argument position, and, therefore, all the higher positions will also be lexical pronouns or clitics (e.g. English, EP). However, if the input shows a null object for a referential entity, say, for a [-animate] entity as in BP, the child assumes that all lower positions can be null. Thus, for a language that has the internal option for full or empty categories, one of the factors that can influence the choice is the animacy status of the antecedent.

The Referential Hierarchy elucidate why the pronoun *ele*, which is used for [+animate] antecedents and sometimes also for [-animate] antecedents, is never used for propositional antecedents.

As for EP, Raposo (2004) claims that the animacy restrictions are not clear in this language, based on his acceptability judgments for the following sentences, which exhibit a null object with a [+animate] antecedent (41), and a [-animate] antecedent (42)

- (41) a. ??*O polícia que agrediu [esse preso]<sub>i</sub> levou \_\_<sub>i</sub> para o hospital.* [EP]  
           the cop that hit that prisoner took \_ to the hospital  
       b. ?*O polícia que agrediu[esse preso]<sub>i</sub> acha que é melhor levar \_\_<sub>i</sub> para o hospital*[EP]  
           the cop that hit that prisoner thinks that is better to take to the hospital  
           ‘The cop that hit that prisoner thinks that it is better to take him to the hospital.’  
 (42) a. ??*O aluno que tem [o teu artigo]<sub>i</sub> em casa devolve \_\_<sub>i</sub> ainda hoje.* [EP]  
           the student that keeps the your paper at home bring back still today  
       b. *O aluno que tem [o teu artigo]<sub>i</sub> o em casa decidiu que ia devolve \_\_<sub>i</sub> ainda hoje.*[EP]  
           the student that keeps the your paper at home decided that will bring back still today  
           ‘The student that keeps your paper at home decided that he will bring it back still today.’

For him, (41a)-(42a) are both unacceptable because the A'-operator (*pro* in Comp) c-commands the antecedent that identifies it, since it moves to FP in the root sentence, (43). This does not happen in (41b)-(42b), since *pro* occurs in the FP of the embedded clause, (44):

- (43) [<sub>FP</sub> *pro* F [<sub>TP</sub> [O aluno que tem o teu artigo em casa] [devolve [<sub>DP</sub> D *pro* ] ainda hoje]]]  
 (44) [<sub>TP</sub> O aluno que tem o teu artigo em casa decidiu [<sub>CP</sub>que [<sub>FP</sub> *pro* F [<sub>TP</sub> ía devolver [<sub>DP</sub> D *pro* ] ainda hoje]] ]

However many EP native speakers consider all the examples in (41)-(42) degraded independently of the animacy effects, which suggests the null operator always raises to the root sentence in EP.

Duarte & Costa (2013) reconsider the animacy effect in EP, and remark that when the antecedent and the omitted object occur in the same sentence, an animacy restriction appears:

- (45) ??*Quando encontro o Pedro<sub>i</sub>, beijo \_\_<sub>i</sub> com ternura.* [EP]  
 when find the Pedro, kiss tenderly  
 ‘When I find Pedro, I kiss him tenderly.’
- (46) *Quando encontro uma gralha<sub>i</sub>, corrijo \_\_<sub>i</sub> imediatamente.* [EP]  
 when find a flaw, correct immediately  
 ‘When I find a flaw, I correct it immediately.’

However, when the referent is recovered from the situational context or has an antecedent external to the null object sentence, no animacy effect occurs:

- (47) [Context: the speaker asks, looking at the picture of a boy in the hearer’s desk]  
 – *Conheceste\_\_ na Itália?* [EP]  
 know in the Italy  
 ‘Did you know him in Italy?’
- (48) A: *E a Ana?* [EP]  
 and the Ana  
 ‘What about Ana?’  
 B: *Encontrei\_\_ ontem no concerto.*  
 Met yesterday in-the concert  
 ‘I met her in the concert yesterday.’

These authors also notice that the information recovered by the null object must be accessible in the situational or linguistic discourse, as illustrated by the following contrast:

- (49) a. *O Pedro tirou os óculos<sub>i</sub> e guardou\_\_<sub>i</sub> na gaveta.* [EP]  
 the Pedro took off the glasses and kept in-the drawer  
 ‘Pedro took off the glasses and kept them in the drawer.’
- b. \**O Pedro tirou os óculos<sub>i</sub>. Ligou a TV e guardou\_\_<sub>i</sub> na gaveta.* [EP]  
 the Pedro took off the glasses. Turn on the TV and kept in-the drawer

Duarte and Costa relate this behavior to the need of the omitted object to be recovered by a null topic whose content is established by the prominent linguistic or situational context.

In sum, in Null-Obj in EP and BP, the object gap corresponds to two different categories. In EP it is a variable an A’-bound by a null constituent in Topic position. As for BP, although most researchers have characterized it as *pro*, it presents some properties that suggest that it should be conceived as an elided DP.

Both BP and EP present animacy restriction on null object antecedents, partially related to a referential hierarchy of overt and null pronouns. Yet, these restrictions disappear when the [+animate] antecedent occurs in the previous situational context or in the immediately precedent linguistic discourse.

## VP ellipsis in EP and PB

Since the eighties, VPE in EP has been extensively studied and the properties that this construction displays in EP and BP carefully analyzed. In the literature on VPE in Portuguese (as for English) the main issues focused have been: the empirical domain of VPE; the categorial status of the gap; the ellipsis strategy and the licensing condition of the elliptical VP; the structural conditions on the linguistic antecedent that legitimate the ellipsis. In this work we will mainly focus on the first three issues, since the last one is not specific of VPE and recovers other kinds of ellipsis and anaphora (for an overview of this subject considering EP, see Matos 1992, chapter 2).

EP and BP share the main features that characterize this construction. However, when the licensing of VPE is done by verbal sequences, there are divergences that result from independent factors in each of these language varieties. This fact is crucial to establish in a principled way an account for this construction in both varieties.

### *VPE, Null-Obj and NCA*

Raposo (1986) was the first to mention the existence in EP of a construction akin to English VPE but involving main verbs. This construction differs from Null-VP by omitting all the complements of the verb (65B.b), and optionally the VP modifiers (Matos 1992), (65B.a):

- (50) A: *Os miúdos puseram os brinquedos na caixa antes do jantar?*  
          ‘the kids put the toys inside-the box before of-the diner?’  
      B: a. *Puseram\_\_.*  
          put  
          ‘Yes, they did.’  
      b. *Puseram\_\_ apenas depois do jantar.*  
          Put just after of-the diner  
          ‘Yes, they did, just after diner.’

Raposo remarks that this construction differs from Null-Obj in not recovering an antecedent from a situational context: (50Ba) is pragmatically anomalous without the linguistic antecedent in (50A):

- (51) [situation: The kids are putting their toys inside a box. Someone entering the room says]:  
      #*Puseram\_\_.*  
      (they) put.

He notices that VPE in EP is not sensitive to islands, as shown in (67), where the omitted material occurs inside a Complex DP with a relative clause.

- (52) *A Maria entregou o dinheiro ao Manel, mas eu sei*  
      the Maria gave the money to the Manel, but I know  
      *de algumas pessoas que nunca teriam entregue\_\_.*  
      of some people that never have.Condit.3PL given  
      ‘Mary gave the money to Manel, but I know some people that would never have given.’

However, the distinction between V-stranding VPE and Null-Obj is not always easy to establish. In fact, the island criterion is not available for BP, where Null\_OBJ is insensitive to islands. Furthermore, as Raposo mentions, when the main verb only selects a direct object, the sentences are ambiguous between the two constructions:

- (53) A: Quem é que viu o filme?  
           who is that saw the movie  
       B: O Manel viu\_\_.  
           the Manel saw  
           interpretations: (i) 'Manel did.'  
                              (ii) 'Manel saw it.'

Accepting Raposo's proposals, Matos (1992) developed an analysis of for EP and presented additional facts that differentiate these constructions. She remarks that VPE in EP may be licensed not only by main verbs (50)-(53), but also by auxiliaries (which are obviously excluded from Null\_Obj), as illustrated in (69B) and (70), where the perfect tense and the passive auxiliaries occur:

- (54) A: As crianças têm estado a estudar?  
           the children have been to study  
           'Have the children been studying?'  
       B. Sim, têm \_\_.  
           'Yes, (they) have.'
- (55) As revistas não foram guardadas na estante, mas os livros já foram\_\_  
       the journals not were stored in-the shelf, but the books already were  
       'The journals have not been stored on the shelf, but the books have been, already.'

She additionally notices that the verbal identifier of the omitted material in VPE is subject to a lexical parallelism condition with some verb in the antecedent, (56)-(57B), a constraint not required in Null-Obj, (58):

- (56) Eu pus os óculos na mesa quando ela também pôs\_\_ /\*colocou\_.  
       I put the glasses on-the table when she also put / placed  
       'I put the glasses on the table when she did, too.'
- (57) A: Não sei se hei-de comprar esta gramática.  
           not know if should buy this grammar  
           I don't know if I should buy this grammar.'  
       B: Claro que {hás-de\_\_! /\*tens\_\_!}  
           of course should / has to  
           'Of course you should!'
- (58) a. Ela tirou o anel do dedo e guardou\_\_ no cofre.  
           she took the ring of-the finger and put in-the safe  
           'She took off the ring from her finger and put it in the safe.'

Matos distinguishes V-stranding VPE from *Null Complement Anaphora* (henceforth NCA), a construction that involves the omission of a sentential complement of the main verb, e.g. *aprovar* 'approve', (59a), and also occurs with restructuring verbs like *querer* 'want', *dever* 'ought' *poder* 'be able to', the last two usually translated by the auxiliaries *shall*, *can/may* in English, (59b).

- (59) a. *Ele lê o jornal todos os dias e eu aprovo\_\_.*  
 he reads the newspaper everyday and I approve\_\_  
 ‘He reads the newspaper everyday, and I approve.’  
 b. *Ele não lê o jornal, embora devesse\_\_.*  
 he not reads the newspaper although ought\_\_  
 ‘He does not read the newspaper, although he should.’

As Null\_Obj, NCA does not require parallelism between the verb identifying the omitted complement and a verbal antecedent (59a); as VPE, it is not sensitive to island contexts (59b). Yet, as expected, when the antecedent and clause with the complement gap exhibit the same verb, the sentences are ambiguous between NCA and VPE.

This characterization of VPE and NCA has been accepted in several works, and developed to account for EP and BP (see Matos & Cyrino 2001, Cyrino & Matos 2002, 2005, for VPE), (Cyrino & Matos 2006, Gonçalves & Matos 2009, for NCA).

### *The parallelism requirement*

Matos (1992) remarks that VPE in EP requires that the verb adjacent to the gap, independently of being an auxiliary or a main verb, be identical to a verb in the antecedent. Thus, (60a) is unacceptable, because in the antecedent only occurs the main verb, but the elliptical VP is locally identified by an auxiliary. In contrast, (60b) is well-formed, since the auxiliary appears in the antecedent and the elliptical sentence. The same lexical parallelism occurs in (60c), where the main verb occurs in both sentences.

- (60) a. *\*Eu não compreendi a situação, mas ele já tinha\_\_há muito.*  
 I not understood the situation, but he already had since long  
 ‘I did not understand the situation, but he already had since long.’  
 b. *Eu não tinha compreendido a situação, mas ele já tinha\_\_há muito.*  
 I not had understood the situation, but he already had since long  
 c. *Eu não compreendi a situação imediatamente, mas ele compreendeu\_\_.*  
 I not understood the situation immediately, but he understood  
 ‘I did not understand the situation immediately, but he did.’

This parallelism requirement becomes understandable when we consider that in Portuguese both auxiliary and main verbs raise out of the verbal phrase to a functional category, T, according to Matos (1992). Thus, in VPE the copy of the moved constituent is part of the ellipsis, as illustrated in (61) for (60b),(60c). In these representations “t” stands for the copy of the moved elements and the base merged elliptical constituents are strikethrough.

- (61) a. ...mas [TP ele<sub>i</sub> [T tinha<sub>j</sub>] [VP<sub>aux</sub> t<sub>i</sub> [VP t<sub>j</sub> ~~compreendido~~ [há muito] ] ]  
 b. ...mas [TP ele<sub>i</sub> [T compreendeu<sub>j</sub>] [VP t<sub>i</sub> t<sub>j</sub> ~~compreendeu~~ [imediatamente] ] ]

Accepting this analysis, we assume that VPE corresponds to an elliptical constituent with internal structure, and requires a lexical and structural identity condition for the recovering of the omitted vP/VP.

Still, Santos (2009), restricting her analysis to EP and focusing on main verbs, questions this verbal parallelism on VPE. She denies the NCA status of the omitted constituent selected by complementation restructuring verbs, like *dever* and *poder*, and takes (62) as a case of

VPE. In doing so she excludes (the copy of) *v* from the elliptical constituent, implicitly assuming that VPE is not a verbal projection, but a CP/TP gap, the complement of the verb.

- (62) *Ela podia ver filmes do César Monteiro e tu também devias.*  
 she could see movies of-the César Monteiro and you also should

Santos also claims that two different non-complementation main verbs may occur in VPE, if they present an identical subcategorization frame:

- (63) *O João vendeu livros à Teresa ontem e a Ana ofereceu*  
 the João sold books to-the Teresa yesterday and the Ana offered  
 [*livros à—Teresa ontem*]  
 books to-the Teresa yesterday  
 ‘João sold books to Teresa yesterday and Anna offered them’

Yet, (63) is not an instance of VPE. As the author’s translation of this example reveals, only the direct object is recovered. This suggests that in some way (63) involves Null-Obj. Corroborating this hypothesis, these examples become degraded in EP, when they occur in islands:

- (64) ??/\**Ele ofereceu livros aos amigos ontem porque ninguém vendeu\_\_*  
 he offered books to-the friends yesterday because nobody sold

This proposal is also supported by Costa & Duarte (2003), who extended the notion of null object to the all range of complements of the verb.

Additionally, Santos (2009) takes examples like (65), where the main verb plus the direct object are overt and some other complement is missing as VPE, by claiming that they may occur in islands in EP:

- (65) *A Ana entregou as chaves ao porteiro quando a irmã entregou o carro.*  
 the Ana gave the keys to-the porter when the sister gave the car  
 ‘Ana gave the keys to the porter when her sister gave him the car.’

Once again, the author’s English translation of this example shows that a VPE interpretation is unavailable. Furthermore, this proposal is problematic, since it presupposes that the verb and the direct object form a complex verbal unit (a sort of light verb structure) able to locally identify the alleged elliptical verbal phrase, only constituted by the complement of the verb.

Adopting these assumptions, Santos is unable to account for the contrasts in acceptability of (56), (57B) and (60a), and loses a unified explanation of VPE in languages like Portuguese.

So, in the current work we will stick to the traditional view that the local identifier of VPE is a verbal element. We also accept that a parallelism requirement on the verbal licenser of the ellipsis regarding its antecedent must be satisfied in a V-stranding VPE language, like Portuguese.

### *Identity condition on ellipsis and licensing of VPE*

Assuming a derivational approach of grammar, the most plausible way to account for the internal structure of VPE is to assume that deletion has applied to a structure fully filled with lexical items. However, these ones may be conceived as feature bundles that must not be Spell-Out at the Phonological interface level, in contrast with the non-elliptical constituents. Thus, independently of adopting a deletion or an interpretative approach of ellipsis the same core properties must be met: the elliptical constituents to be deleted/interpreted must be recovered on the basis of the lexical and structural material of the antecedent.

As mentioned by several authors, the identity requirements on ellipsis must be better understood as a condition of lexical and structural non-distinctiveness. In fact, local restrictions imposed by the overt elements in the elliptical sentence may override strict identity. Thus, as shown in Matos (1992), there is no need of morphological coincidence in the mood or tense of the verb forms of the local identifier of VPE and its antecedent.

- (66) *Nós temos posto o carro na garagem, embora ele ainda não tenha\_\_.*  
we have put.INDICATIVE the car in-the garage, although he yet not  
have.SUBJUNCTIVE  
'We have put the car in the garage, although he has not, yet.'
- (67) *O João tem comido demasiado e a Ana disse que (ela) também tinha\_\_*  
the João have-PRS.3SG eaten too much and the Ana said that she  
also have\_Past.  
'João has been eating too much and Ana said that she did too.'

In addition to the semantic and structural non-distinctiveness between VPE and its antecedent, it has been recognized that VPE is subject to a syntactic licensing condition. The contrasts in English between a VPE sentence in (68a) and the ungrammatical sequence with a main verb in (68b), shows that a necessary condition for VPE is that the licensing verb moves out the verbal phrase to a sentence functional projection:

- (68) a. John was reading this book and Mary was\_\_, too.  
b. \*John started reading this book and Mary started\_\_ too.

In fact, as it is well known, the predicative main verbs in current English do not move out of the verbal phrase. The availability of VPE with main verbs in languages like EP, with generalized verb movement, is consistent with that licensing condition.

Although there is some consensus that the verbal licenser of VPE must occur in a functional category c-commanding vP/VP, occasionally, divergent proposals have been advanced. Thus, Rouveret (2012), apparently ignoring the contrasts in (83) for English, claims that VPE across languages (including English and EP) is licensed by a verb heading vP. For him, the difference between the languages with and without VPE relies on the fact that only in the latter the verb raises to Infl to complete its verbal morphology.

Even accepting that a verbal element must occur in a functional head to license VPE, the nature of this functional category in Portuguese and the implementation of the licensing strategy have varied, mostly in consequence of the adopted framework.

Working on late Government and Binding theory, Matos (1992), assumed that T was the host of the VPE licenser, and, proposed a version of Rizzi's (1986) Proper Head Government as licensing principle:

- (69) VPE is licensed by a head with verbal predicative or temporal value that properly governs the elliptical VP.

Within the Minimalist Program, where government takes no place, alternative proposals have arisen. In early Minimalism, mainly focusing VPE with main verbs in EP, Martins (1994) argues that the licenser of VPE is Sigma, a functional category occurring above TP and VP, proposed by I. Laka to account for sentence polarity and preverbal focus:

- (70) [CP [ $\Sigma$ P [AgrSP [TP ...[VP ]]]]]

According to Martins, the licensing and identification of VPE is achieved by movement of the verb to  $\Sigma$  with strong-V features, and checking of the (truth value) features of the null VP, which raises to adjoin [ $\text{Spec}, \Sigma$ P] or  $\Sigma$ P. She also claims that there is a correlation between VPE and enclisis: Romance languages with enclisis as unmarked pattern of clitic placement in finite clauses present VPE, e.g. EP, Galician, as a consequence of V movement to Sigma (enclisis would arise because the verb raises to  $\Sigma$  and the clitic stays in AgrS); in contrast, those languages that systematically exhibit proclisis in finite clauses, lack VPE, e.g. Spanish, French, because the verb does not move to sigma.

Although attractive, this proposal is unable to account for VPE in EP in negative (71) and embedded sentences (72), or both (73):

- (71) A: *As crianças têm estudado ultimamente?*  
           the children have studied lately  
           ‘Have the children studied lately?’  
       B. *Não, não têm\_\_.*  
           No, not have  
           ‘No, they haven’t.’
- (72) A *Ana não tem trabalhado muito embora diga que tem \_\_.*  
       the Ana not has worked hard although says that has  
       ‘Ana has not been working hard, although she says she has.’
- (73) *Tu tens estado a trabalhar muito ainda que digas que não tens*  
       You has been working too much although says that not has  
       ‘You did not work too much, although she says she did.’

For Martins (1994:183), in negative sentences in EP, Neg occupies  $\Sigma^\circ$  and the verb stays in AgrS; this would account for the Clitic–Verb order in these sentences in standard EP (89). However, accepting this assumption, the author must admit that the licenser of the elided VP in (71B) is AgrS. The same prediction for VPE (cf. (72) and (73)) arises from Martins’ analysis of embedded sentences: to account for proclisis in EP these domains, she claims that  $\Sigma$  raises to C and the inflected verb occurs in AgrS (Martins 1994:202).

- (74) a. *As crianças não lhe telefonaram.*  
           the children not him.CL phoned  
           ‘The children did not phone  
       b. [ $\Sigma$ P *As crianças* [ $\Sigma$  *não*] [ $\text{AgrS}$  *lhe* [ $\text{AgrS}$  *telefonaram*] ...]



This analysis faces another problem. As shown by BP, where proclisis is the predominant pattern, there is no direct correlation between VPE and enclisis, assuming, as usual, that in this variety of Portuguese clitics have not yet been grammaticalized as prefixes of the verb.

Within the Minimalist Program, reconsidering previous work (Matos & Cyrino 2001, Cyrino & Matos 2002), Cyrino & Matos (2005) propose that VPE is licensed in the following configuration:

- (75) In VPE the elliptical verbal predicate is licensed under local c-command by the lexically filled functional head with V-features that merges with it.

The authors claim that the functional head differs in EP and BP and remark that (90) must be complemented with other provisos to account for VPE across languages.

### *VPE licensing in EP and BP*

The main differences between EP and BP concern VPE with verbal sequences. In EP certain verbal sequences easily allow a VPE interpretation, but others do not favor this reading. In opposition, the VPE interpretation is always clearly preferred in BP.

Matos (1992) shows that in EP the auxiliary sequences in (76a)-(76b) and (77a)-(77b) allow a full recovering of the VPE content:

- (76) A *Ana tem estado a comprar esses livros às crianças*  
 the Ana has been to buy those books to-the children  
 ‘Ana has been buying those books to her children.’  
 a. *e a Maria também tem\_\_.* [EP]  
 and the Maria also has  
 ‘and Maria has, too.’  
 Reading: [ \_\_=(has) been buying those books to the children]  
 b. *e a Maria também tem estado \_\_.* [EP]  
 and the Maria also has been  
 ‘and Maria has been, too.’  
 Reading: [ \_\_=(been) buying those books to the children]  
 (77) *As revistas não têm estado a ser arrumadas nas estantes pela bibliotecária*  
 the journals not have been to be stored on-the shelves by-the librarian  
 ‘The journals have not been being stored on the shelves by the librarian’  
 a. *mas os livros têm\_\_.* [EP]  
 but the books have  
 Reading: [ \_\_ (have) been being store on the shelves by the librarian]  
 b. *mas os livros têm sido\_\_.* [EP]  
 but the books have been  
 Reading: [ \_\_(been) being store on the shelves by the librarian]

But, when the verbal sequences include the main verb, the VPE reading is available or lost depending on the auxiliary: while with the perfect tense auxiliary verb, *ter* ‘have’, the VPE interpretation is obtained (cf. (78)), with the progressive auxiliary, *estar* –a– *Vinf*, (79) or the passive auxiliary (80) the VPE reading is preferentially lost, despite the fact that it should be compelling when the main verb obligatorily requires its complements:

- (78) a. *A Ana tem lido poemas aos alunos e a Maria também tem lido.* [EP]  
 the Ana has read poems to the students and the Maria also has read  
 ‘Ana has read poems to her students and Mary has too.’
- b. *Este ano temos ido ao teatro regularmente porque a Maria também tem ido.* [EP]  
 the Ana have gone to the theatre regularly because the Maria also  
 has gone  
 ‘This year we have gone to the theatre regularly because Maria has, too.’
- c. *Ela não tem posto as suas economias nesse banco, mas têm amigos que têm posto.* [EP]  
 she not has put the her savings in that bank, but has friends that  
 has put  
 ‘She has not put her savings in that bank, but she has some friends who did.’
- (79) a. *A Ana está a ler poemas aos alunos e a Maria também está a ler.* [EP]  
 the Ana is to read poems to-the students and the Maria also is to read  
 (i) preferred reading: ‘Ana is reading poems to her students and Mary is also reading.’  
 (ii) unlikely reading: ‘Ana is reading poems to her students and Mary is to.’
- b. *??Este ano estamos a ir ao teatro regularmente porque a Maria também está a ir.* [EP]  
 this year are to go to the theatre regularly because the Maria  
 also was to going  
 ‘This year we are going to the theatre regularly because Mary is (also going to the theatre regularly.)’
- c. *?Ela não está a pôr as suas economias nesse banco, mas tem amigos que estão a pôr.* [EP]  
 she not is to put the her savings in that bank, but has friend that  
 are to put  
 ‘She is not putting her savings in that bank, but she has some friends that are putting (their savings in that bank).’
- (80) *As revistas não têm estado a ser arrumadas nas estantes pela bibliotecária*  
 the journals not have been to be stored on-the shelves by-the librarian  
 ‘The journals have not been being stored on the shelves by the librarian’
- a. *#mas os livros têm estado a ser arrumados.* [EP]  
 but the books have been to be stored
- b. *#mas os livros foram arrumados.* [EP]  
 but the books were stored

In (79a), the verb *ler* ‘read’ allows two interpretations for the absence of complements of the verb: a cognate Null Object interpretation, which is preferential, and VPE reading, which is felt as unnatural by the speakers. In (79b) and (79c) the null object reading is not available in EP, even in the extended version of Costa & Duarte 2003 because the omitted constituents occur in island domains and the main verb obligatorily select their complements; nevertheless, the VPE interpretation of these examples is somewhat marginal in EP<sup>1</sup>. As for (80), the VP ellipsis is lost (as in (79a)): the reader knows that the books have been ranged somewhere by someone, but the precise information about the person who ranged the books and the place where they have been stored is lost.

<sup>1</sup> Notice that although in standard EP the examples in (79c) are not fully acceptable in EP, they tend to be more easily permitted by the young generation. A plausible explanation for this fact, is the increasing grammaticalization of progressive *estar* in their internal grammar.

Matos (1992) imputes this different behavior to the properties of the auxiliaries involved. The perfect tense auxiliary *ter* selects a Past Participle projection with active v-features (81) and may form with it a verbal unit, as evidenced by the possibility of these verbs to move together in T-to-C constructions in EP (82).

(81) ... [*ter* [VP<sub>past part</sub> ... [V<sub>past part</sub> <+v>] ... ] ] ...

- (82) a. Que têm lido provavelmente os alunos? Até posso adivinhar!  
 What have read probably the students ? (I) even may guess  
 ‘What did probably the students read? I even may guess it!’  
 b. [<sub>CP</sub> Que [<sub>C</sub> têm lido] [provavelmente os alunos] ]

As for *estar*, she adopted Raposo’s (1989) proposal that this verb selects a Prepositional Infinitival Construction in EP, formed by a small clause headed by the prepositional marker “a” and a TP infinitival complement:

(83) ... *estar*[<sub>SC</sub>DP[<sub>particle</sub>a]][<sub>TP</sub>...V<sub>inf</sub>...] ...

Matos shows that this construction optionally presents restructuring, based on the optionality of clitic climbing in this construction:

- (84) a. *Ela está-lhe a dar o livro.*  
 She is-CL to give the book  
 b. *Ela está a dar-lhe<sub>CL</sub> o livro*  
 she is to give-CL the book  
 ‘She is giving him the book).

She also argues that restructuring in this construction is obligatory in EP in the context of VPE, mainly grounded on the position of *também*. This adverbial must have local scope over the verbal licenser of the elided VP. As shown in (85), *também* must precede and c-command the whole verbal sequence to produced full acceptable VPE interpretations:

- (85) a. *A manteiga está a ser posta no frigorífico e a cerveja também está a ser*  
 the butter is being put in-the fridge and the beer also is being  
 ‘The butter is being put in the fridge and the beer is being too.’  
 b. ??*A manteiga está a ser posta no frigorífico e a cerveja está também a ser*  
 the butter is being put in-the fridge and the beer is also being

Finally, to account for the impossibility of recovering the main verb complements in sequences involving the passive auxiliary plus the main verb (cf. (80)), Matos (1992) claims that the Passive Participle is unable to license VPE in EP due to its deficitary status as a verbal category.

Thus, Matos (1992) concludes that in EP the sequences formed by the aspectual *estar* plus the main verb in the infinitive, as well as those constituted by the passive auxiliary plus the main verb in the passive participle do not participate in the verbal chain headed by the auxiliary in the finite T that licenses the elided VP, and allows its recovering.

This analysis has been refined and developed by Cyrino and Matos to account for the contrasts in VPE in BP and EP. In fact, in contrast with EP, in BP the VPE interpretation is clearly preferred in all types of verbal sequences, i.e. those that only exhibit auxiliaries and those that present auxiliaries plus the main verb. The authors imputed these contrasts to the

different properties of the progressive and the passive auxiliaries in EP and BP and to the properties of the functional categories they select in these language varieties.

Cyrino & Matos (2002, 2005) proposed that in EP and English, the licenser for VPE is T, but, in BP, VPE can be licensed by other functional heads: T, Asp or Passive Participle. They based their proposal on the contrasts found in sequences of auxiliary verbs (Progressive and Passive) followed by the main verb when the adverb *também* ‘too/also’ intervenes in the verbal sequence.

In a verbal sequence, when *também* is placed between an auxiliary and the last verb, it brakes this verbal sequence and forces the last verb to be the licenser of the elided constituent, as illustrated in (86) and in (87), which involve the Progressive and the Passive auxiliaries plus the main verb. These examples stress the different behavior of BP and EP in these contexts: in BP the VPE reading is available, in EP it is (almost) lost:

- (86) a. Ela estava a chegar de Inglaterra e nós estávamos também a chegar.  
 she was to arrive from England and we were also to arrive  
 VPE reading: ‘She was arriving from England and we were too.’

[√BP, ??EP]

Non-VPE reading: ‘She was arriving from England and we were also arriving (from somewhere)’

[√BP, √EP]

- b. Ele estava {cantando/a cantar} cantigas às crianças, porque eu estava  
 he was singing to sing songs to-the children since I was  
*também* cantando/a cantar.

(i) VPE reading: ‘He was singing songs to the children, since I was too.’

[√BP, ??EP]

(ii) Cognate null object reading:

‘He was singing songs to the children, because I was also singing’

[√BP, √EP]

The sentences involving cognate objects are particularly revealing, because in this case the intransitive reading is almost mandatory in EP, but optional in BP. Note that the fact that *estar* selects the gerund in BP, but the infinitive in standard EP does not change the preferred interpretations.

Likewise, in sentences with the passive auxiliary and the main verb, in BP, the elided constituent recovers all the non-moved arguments of the main verb, but in EP this does not happens:

- (87) Os brinquedos foram dados às crianças e os livros<sub>i</sub> foram<sub>j</sub>  
 the toys were given to-the children and the books were  
*também* dados .

also given

(i) VPE reading:

‘The toys were given to the children and the books were too’

[√BP]

(ii) Non VPE reading:

‘The toys were given to the children and the books were also given (away)’

[√EP]

In (86) and (87) the verbs with finite inflection raise to T, but the verbs in the progressive constructions in the gerund or in the expression “a\_V<sub>inf</sub>”, as well the verbs in the passive participle occupy the head of a projection of their own, respectively Asp(P) and Pass(P), an instance of *Voice(P)*.

- (88) a. (...) [TP estava também [AspP cantando [vP \_\_\_\_ ] ]]  
           was     also                   singing  
       b. (...) [TP estava também [AspP a [TP cantar [vP \_\_\_\_ ] ]]  
           was     also                   to     sing  
       c. (...) [TP foram também [PassP dados [vP \_\_\_\_ ] ]]  
           were    also                   given

In BP, the verbs in Asp and Pass may license the elided VP; the same does not happen in EP, where finite T is the licenser of VPE. This shows that, in BP, the verbs that participate in the VPE licensing sequences have a greater autonomy than in EP and, apparently, restructuring does not apply to verbal sequences in BP. Thus, Matos & Cyrino (2001) claim that in BP, the auxiliary verbs select non-defective functional projections, and exhibits another active T domain able to license elliptical constituents. Therefore, both the possibility of having the interposition of *também* and the possibility for the lower (main) verb to be able to license VPE is explained. In both cases the licenser of ellipsis in BP is the functional head that is lower in the structure:

- (89) a. *A Ana está lendo os livros às crianças e a Maria está* [BP]  
           the Ana is   reading the books to-the children and the Maria is  
           *também lendo.*  
           also       reading  
           ‘Ana is reading the books to the children and Maria is too.’  
       b. ...e a Maria [TP [T° *está*] [vAuxP t [TP *também* [T° <+active> *lendo*] [AspP t [vP-]]]]]

Additional evidence for a second TP (functional) projection comes from clitic placement in BP. In EP the modal *poder*, but not the auxiliary *ter* of compound tenses, selects TP – consequently, the following contrast is observed:

- (90) a. João podia [TP ler-*lhe*                   o livro]. [EP]  
           João could   read-CL.DAT.3SG the book  
           ‘João could read him/her the book.’  
       b. \*Ele tem [vAuxP lido-*lhe*                   o livro]  
           He has       read- CL.DAT.3SG the book  
       c. \*Ele tinha [vAuxP já       *lhe*                   lido o livro]  
           He has       already CL.DAT.3SG read the book

On the contrary, in BP, the possibility for proclisis to the past participle and to the gerund in the constructions with auxiliaries confirms that these select TP active domains (91). As expected, in these domains, *também* can co-occur with the clitic (92).

- (91) a. João tem [ *te*                   lido o livro] [BP]  
           João has CL.DAT.3SG read the book  
           ‘João  
       b. João está [*te*                   enviando o livro]  
           João is CL.DAT.3SG read the book  
       (92) O Pedro está *te* enviando livros e João está *também te* enviando livros. [BP]

These data lead Cyrino & Matos (2005) to refine the VPE licensing condition proposed in (75), which stated that “VPE is licensed by a lexically filled functional head with v-features

that locally c-commands the elliptical predicate”. Although necessary, this condition is not sufficient, since it predicts that languages with Generalized Verb Movement have VPE, a prediction that is not borne out by languages like Spanish, French or Italian.

The authors attributed the lack of VPE in those languages to a grammaticalization process of the auxiliary verbs. This grammaticalization produces the weakening of the aspectual value of auxiliaries and the loss of the temporal value of the tense affixes that affect the auxiliary verb. Thus, in the French and Spanish examples below, despite the fact that the auxiliary exhibits a present tense affix, the composed verbal form [Aux<sub>Present</sub> + Past Participle] is interpreted as past and can be used as the *Simple Past*:

- (93) a. Jean a vu ses amis.  
 b. Juan ha visto a suyos amigos.  
 ‘Jean/Juan saw his friends.’

Cyrino and Matos also claimed that in languages in which the complex verb forms are highly grammaticalized (e.g. Spanish and French), Asp is closely linked to Tense and it is not interpreted as part of the vP predicate, (94):

- (94) [CP C [TP T [Asp ... [vP ]]]]

In contrast, in the languages in which these complex verb forms keep their aspectual values (e.g. Portuguese and English), AspP is understood as an extended projection of the vP predicate forming a complex Asp\_vP:

- (95) [CP C [TP T [AspP-vP Asp-vP ... [vP ]]]]

Adopting this analysis, Cyrino & Matos (2005) propose that the parametrical difference between generalized V-movement languages with and without VPE is the availability/unavailability of immediate command of the elided predicate by the potential licensor.

This happens in EP, since T merges with Asp-vP, as well as in BP, where the verbal licensor may occur in Asp(P) or Pass(P), since these categories may merge with vP, satisfying the immediate c-command requirement. However, it does not occur in French or Spanish, because Asp intervenes between T and vP.

Building on that work, Cyrino (2013) argues that BP has lost “long” verb movement and, because of that, null objects can be licensed as ellipsis (as seen above). In the same line of reasoning, Tescari Neto (2013) shows that VPE in BP is licensed by the verb in a very low functional projection.

## References

- Barra-Ferreira, M. (2000). *Argumentos Nulos em Português Brasileiro*. Master Thesis, Unicamp, Campinas.
- Bianchi, V. and Figueiredo, M.C. (1994). On some properties of agreement-object in Italian and Brazilian Portuguese. In M. Mazzola (ed.) *Issues and Theory in Romance Linguistics* Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, pp. 181-197.
- Costa, J. and Duarte, I. (2003) Objectos Nulos em debate. In I. Castro and I. Duarte (eds). *Razões e Emoção*. Lisboa: Imprensa Nacional – Casa da Moeda, pp. 249-260.

- Cyrino, S. (1997). *O Objeto Nulo no Português Brasileiro: Um estudo sintático-diacrônico*. Londrina: Editora da UEL. [Published version of Cyrino's (1994) PhD Thesis. Unicamp, Campinas]
- Cyrino, S. (2013). On Richness of Tense and Verb Movement in Brazilian Portuguese. In M.V. Camacho-Taboada A. Jiménez-Fernández, J. Martín-González and M. Reyes-Tejedor (eds.) *Information Structure and Agreement*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 297-317.
- Cyrino, S. and Matos, G. (2002). VPE in European and Brazilian Portuguese: A comparative analysis. *Journal of Portuguese Linguistics*, 1(2), pp. 177-214.
- Cyrino, S. and Matos, G. (2005) Local Licensers and Recovering in VPE. *Journal of Portuguese Linguistics*. 4(2), pp. 79-112.
- Cyrino, S. and Matos, G. 2006. Null Complement Anaphora in Romance: Deep or Surface Anaphora?. In J. Doetjes and P. González *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2004*, 95-120. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Cyrino, S., Duarte, E. and Kato, M. (2000). Visible subjects and invisible clitics in Brazilian Portuguese. In M. Kato and E. Negrão (eds.) *Brazilian Portuguese and the Null Subject Parameter Frankfurt am Main*, Vervuert. Madrid: Iberoamericana, pp. 55-73
- Duarte, I. (1987) *A construção de Topicalização na Gramática do Português: Regência, Ligação e condições sobre movimento*. Phd. Thesis, Universidade de Lisboa, Lisboa:
- Duarte, I. and Costa, J. (2013). Objecto Nulo. In Raposo, E., M<sup>a</sup> F. Nascimento, M<sup>a</sup> A. Mota, L. Segura and A. Mendes (eds.), *Gramática do Português*, vol. II, Lisboa: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian, pp. 2339-2348.
- Farrell, P. (1990). Null objects in Brazilian Portuguese. *The Linguistic Review* 8, pp. 325-346.
- Galves, C. (1989) Objet Nul et Structure de la Proposition en Portugais Brésilien. *Revue des Langues Romanes* 93: 305-336.
- Goldberg, L. (2005). *Verb-Stranding VPE: A Cross-Linguistic Study*. PhD. Thesis. McGill University, Montréal.
- Gonçalves, A and Matos, G. (2009). Ellipsis and Restructuring in European Portuguese. In E. Aboh, E. Linden, J. Queer and P. Sleeman (eds.) *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory*, 109-129. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Huang, C.T.J. (1984). On the Distribution and Reference of the Empty Categories. *Linguistic Inquiry* 15, pp. 531-574.
- Kato, M. (1993). The Distribution of Pronouns and Null Elements in Object Position in Brazilian Portuguese. In W. Ashby, M. Perissinotto and E. Raposo (eds.) *Linguistic Perspectives on the Romance Languages*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Martins, A.M. (1994). Enclisis, VP-deletion and the nature of Sigma. *Probus* 6, pp. 173-205.
- Matos, G. (1992) *Construções de Elipse do Predicado em Português: SV Nulo e Despojamento*. PhD Thesis, Universidade de Lisboa, Lisboa
- Matos, G. and Cyrino, S. (2001). Elipse de VP no Português Europeu e no Português Brasileiro". *Boletim da Abralín* 26, número especial, pp.386-390.
- Raposo, E. (1986). On the null object in European Portuguese. In O. Jaeggli and C. Silva Corvalán (eds.) *Studies in Romance Linguistics*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications, pp. 373-390.
- Raposo, E. (1989). Prepositional Infinitival construction in European Portuguese. In O. Jaeggli and Safir, K. (eds.). *The Null Subject Parameter*. Dordrecht/Boston/London: Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp. 277-305.
- Raposo, E. (2004). Objetos Nulos e CLLD: Uma teoria unificada. *Revista da ABRALIN* 3 (1,2), pp. 41-73.
- Rizzi, L. (1986). Null Objects and the Theory of pro. *Linguistic Inquiry* 17, pp. 501-558.

- Rouveret, A. (2012) “VPE, phases and the syntax of morphology”. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*. Vol. 30(3), pp 897-963.
- Santos, A. L. (2009). *Minimal Answers: Ellipsis, Syntax and discourse in the acquisition of European Portuguese*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Tescari-Neto, A. (2013). *On Verb Movement in Brazilian Portuguese: A Cartographic Study*. PhD Thesis, Università Ca’Foscari, Venice.